

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/071,238	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BREHM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Callie E. Shosho	<b>Art Unit</b> 1714	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** Allowed

 (1) Callie E. Shosho.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Csaba Henter.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 27 October 2005
**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

4,5,17,19,21-22,24-25

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**
See Continuation Sheet
**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in ~~the Notice of Allowability~~ Part II above.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner's amendment was agreed to and authorized by Mr. Henter.

The amendment to claims 4, 19, and 22 to change "parts" to "%" was made in order that the language of the present claims is consistent with the original claim language. Support for such change is found in original claim 6.

The amendment to each of claims 5, 24, and 25 was made to clarify the claims in order to make clear that it is the platelets and the pigments that are coated.

The amendment to claim 17 was made in order to clarify what is meant by "other than substantially parallel". Support for the amendment is found on page 6, lines 16-26 of the present specification.

The amendment to claim 21 was made in order to prevent claim 21 from being broader than the claim on which it depends given that there is no disclosure in claim 4 of compact beads.